

E 710
.Q7
Copy 1



SPEECH OF JOSIAH QUINCY,

Chairman of Democratic State Convention.

Worcester, October 2, 1895.

Fellow-Democrats of Massachusetts:—We meet this year in our annual convention under conditions far more encouraging and hopeful for our party than those which have confronted us during the last two years. Industry, commerce, and finance have very largely emerged from the cloud of doubt and depression that has hung over them, and are again in the sunlight of prosperity. The Democratic party is casting off the political discouragement which has accompanied conditions that have now passed by. I shall cite no evidence of the wonderful revival of business, bringing with it higher prices, fuller employment, and better wages, that has taken place during the last six months, because even Republicans are forced to concede its existence. Of the revival of Democracy throughout the nation we trust to show conclusive evidence on election day.

Great as was the tidal wave under which we were buried last year, it was hardly greater than that which overwhelmed the Republican party in 1890. I think we shall find that it has so far subsided this year that, if the same rate of retrogression continues for another year, the Democratic party will again be victorious in the presidential election of 1896. Republicans who hastily assumed after the election of 1894 that they had no longer to meet an effective opposition from the Democratic party, and that they could afford to indulge in quarrels among themselves for personal or factional supremacy, are likely to find their assumptions unfounded.

Democracy never surrenders. Its defeats of the last two years were inflicted more by Democrats than by Republicans. But that any considerable number of Democrats have abandoned the principles of their party and been converted to

E710
v. 7

Republicanism I do not for a moment believe. The causes which produced this political dissatisfaction or indifference—and business depression accounts for more than three-quarters of it—now lie behind us. Our political future is again bright with promise.

We can see no reason to believe that the voters of the country have changed their opinion of the modern principles of the Republican party,—an opinion deliberately formed and twice unmistakably expressed. We can see no evidence that the same Republicanism which was so unpopular in 1890 and 1892 has gained any real, positive, lasting strength with the people since that time.

OLD ISSUES DEAD.

Upon what issues can the Republican party ask the country to restore it to power next year? What political policy or programme can it present in opposition to that of the party in power as a basis for its appeal to the people? Of the old issues upon which it formerly carried the country not one is left.

The sectional issue upon which Republicanism so long succeeded is fortunately dead and buried forever. The rebel brigadier no longer serves as a bug-bear. The bloody shirt has been sent to the political wash-tub. Upon the battle-fields where they once met in mortal combat the veterans of the blue and the gray are completely reunited. Time has done its full and perfect work.

The issue of the federal control of elections, which in the last national campaign was almost as prominent a feature in the Republican policy as the maintenance of McKinleyism, seems to have dropped completely out of sight. In an article in the *Forum* for April, 1891, Senator Hoar declared that the purpose to keep the promise to secure honest elections by the exercise of the national legislative authority "is the one essential thing that constitutes Republicanism." If this be true, Republicanism appears to have lost its essence; for, with every vestige of federal control of elections swept from the statute book by a Democratic Congress, the revival of this issue seems to be the last thing that the Republican leaders propose.

The chairman of the Executive Committee of their national organization, coming from the State of Tom Reed, even declares, with a brutal disregard of the feelings of our Massachusetts senators, that it was a mistake ever to raise it. It really seems as if the Republican party had learned one lesson, and had been converted, on grounds of expediency, if not of principle, to the Democratic position on this question of fundamental importance. If the Democratic party had accomplished nothing else by its victory of 1892 than to settle the question of federal control of elections, and save the country from one of the greatest dangers that ever threatened its political future, it would still be entitled to the gratitude and support of the people.

Another Republican plea that has done good service in the past is also elimi-



nated from future political contests. Two Democratic administrations have effectually disposed of the claim that this country only contained one political party capable of carrying on its government with safety. Party contests now stand upon a proper and normal basis. The political monopoly of the Republican party has been permanently broken down. The people know that they have a free choice between two parties, each of which is able to carry on the government with entire safety to the country; and they will decide between them according to their political preferences and according to the records of the two parties in office.

Of the pension question, which has in the past figured to a considerable extent among Republican campaign issues, there is very little left. Pension legislation is practically completed. Any further changes must be of comparatively narrow scope, and can hardly be made a party issue. So far as the administration of the Pension Office is concerned, it is scarcely pretended that there is any case from the standpoint of the veteran against the gallant Union soldier whom the President has placed at its head. Even Corporal Tanner, who helped the surplus disappear so successfully, concedes that he is a good official; and applications have been so rapidly acted on under his administration that the expected diminution through deaths in the number of pensioners has been postponed.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

In regard to questions arising out of our foreign relations, while some Republican leaders have shown a disposition to improve every chance to oppose the administration in this field, nothing but the Hawaiian question has yet been raised to the dignity of even a minor issue. The Democratic administration and the Democratic party are squarely opposed to the annexation of these islands, with their mixed population and their coolie labor system. The Republican party is entitled to the support of all who believe that the annexation of Hawaii to this country is not only desirable, but is of such supreme importance that it outweighs the great questions of our home politics.

There is no question involved as to whether American influence shall remain paramount in those islands, for that it must in any case continue to be; or as to whether any other country shall be allowed to acquire them, for we have declared that this cannot be permitted; nor is there any question as to the form of the Hawaiian government. It is simply a question of formal annexation, with all the difficult problems which that would raise, as opposed to the maintenance of the present status. It would be a poor compliment to the intelligence of American voters to assume that they would allow such a question to be an appreciable factor in the election of their President and the settlement of their national policies.

What further issues of foreign policy the Republican leaders may attempt to raise, to cover up the weakness of their position on domestic questions, we can

only conjecture: but this we know, that, with Secretary Olney at the head of the State Department, they are going to find it hard to place the administration in any vulnerable position, and it is quite within the bounds of probability that they may be glad to drop all discussion of foreign questions before another year has passed. In this connection a few words upon a matter of present interest pertaining to our foreign relations, though not as yet having any partisan aspect, may not be out of place. The question of the political future of Cuba, again brought prominently forward by the insurrection now in progress in that island, is one to which the people of this country cannot be indifferent. While there are no good reasons for concerning ourselves especially with the affairs of the Hawaiian Islands, thousands of miles distant in the middle of the Pacific, there are strong reasons to lead us to take an interest in the future of this great island, with its extraordinary natural resources and advantages, lying within only a few miles of our coast.

While our government must proceed in accordance with the obligations of international law, the sentiment of our people can at least claim free utterance. Spanish rule in Cuba at the close of the nineteenth century is a political anomaly and anachronism. There is no territory in this hemisphere of anything like the importance, population, or wealth of Cuba, that has not long been either entirely independent of European rule or practically self-governing. If the letter of the Monroe doctrine practically forbids the further acquisition of American territory by any European power, its spirit calls for American sympathy with such an effort as that which Cuba is now making to throw off European control. That Spain has, by her misgovernment of Cuba, furnished ample justification for revolt, few will deny. The immediate question is whether such a state of war exists as to justify our government in recognizing the insurgents as belligerents, and according them belligerent rights, thus greatly strengthening their chances of success. I believe that the general sentiment of our people is strongly in favor of giving them such recognition as soon as sufficient information is secured to warrant that action without violation of the principles of international law; and it should not be forgotten that it took Spain ten years to put down the last insurrection.

Probably this country would not, under any circumstances, assume the responsibility of the government of Cuba, either by its acquisition by purchase from Spain, if that were possible, or by its admission to the Union on the application of its people. But we can all agree that Cuba ought to be commercially annexed to the United States, and that this would be of great benefit to the peoples of both countries. Such a natural commercial union is inconsistent with the exploitation of Cuba for the benefit of Spain, and must depend upon the success of the effort to throw off Spanish rule. If we must remember our obligations to a nation with which we are at peace, we need not forget the claims of humanity and liberty.

CURRENCY AND FINANCE.

Coming now to the leading political questions, the contest that has raged over the currency claims our first attention. Have the Republican leaders, who are so fond of pointing out Democratic shortcomings, cast petty politics and partisan interests aside, and stood squarely behind the administration in its efforts in behalf of sound money? Have they done their share in the campaign of popular education upon this subject? Have they so clearly declared the position of their party, by their utterances, by their Congressional action, and by the platforms of its conventions, that they could not be accused of fishing in troubled waters with the hope of catching votes?

Let their silence answer: let Tom Reed's squirming when he had to face the issue of a gold standard in Congress in connection with the last bond issue; let the course of the much heralded Cleveland Convention of Republican Clubs, which evaded the silver question by discovering at the last moment that it would be unconstitutional to say anything about it; let the unrestrained and unrebuked activity of the chairman of the Republican National Committee in behalf of free silver.

Turn to the record of the Democratic administration. The country has been passing through a period of financial disturbance, when absolute firmness on the part of the head of the government in support of sound money has been worth untold millions to our business interests. The positive knowledge of those controlling our own financial markets and furnishing the loans upon which business is so largely done, as well as of the foreign holders of a vast quantity of our securities, that at whatever cost, in money or in popularity, against whatever opposition, in Congress or out of it, every power of the Executive would be exhausted to maintain all our forms of currency at a parity with each other, and redeemable in gold at the option of the holder, has been our rock of safety.

Confidence is the basis of all business. Shaken to its foundation by the effects of the Sherman silver law, it has been restored since the repeal of that law by the firmness and wisdom with which our treasury has been protected and kept in a position to meet all its obligations. In a situation where weakness would have been fatal and compromise would have been surrender, President Cleveland has stood firm,—first for the unconditional repeal of the law which brought on the trouble, then for the use of the public credit, to any extent, to preserve the financial honor of the country,—with the assistance of Congress, if possible, but without it, if necessary.

And we can also congratulate ourselves as Democrats upon the sound and outspoken position that our party is taking in the country upon the currency question. Thanks to the unyielding and uncompromising attitude of the administration, there can no longer be any question that the Democratic National Convention of 1896 will be as sound in its utterance upon the silver question as was

the Democratic Convention of 1892. Whatever Democratic silver conventions, so called, have been held, it should not be forgotten that there is no power anywhere to place the Democratic party on any other ground than that on which it stood at Chicago in 1892, when it made a declaration absolutely inconsistent with the free and independent coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1. The supporters of that heresy, by whatever political name they may call themselves, are in direct opposition to the last authoritative utterance of the Democratic party on the question of silver currency.

Without a Chief Executive of such a character, and a Secretary of the Treasury in entire harmony with him, this battle could never have been brought to a successful issue. Through misrepresentation and abuse, through open attacks and secret opposition, the administration has kept upon the even tenor of its way, upholding always the financial honor of the country and the soundness of its currency.

The management of the finances and of the currency of the country is safer in Democratic than in Republican hands for the following reasons, among others :—

1. However the Democratic party may sometimes fall short of an ideal standard in the practice of public economy, its professed doctrines at least are in that direction ; and its record shines by comparison with that of the Republican party. Economy in public expenditures is one of its historic principles, and whatever forces there are in the country to oppose reckless extravagance are found within its ranks. It is only a few years since the Republican party deliberately squandered a surplus, in order to maintain a high tariff ; and it will doubtless now endeavor to maintain a deficit, in order that its existence may serve as an excuse for the restoration of higher duties. With its paternalistic and centralizing tendencies, that party constantly finds new ways for spending the money of the people.

2. The Republican party has furnished to the country no political leader whose record for consistent, uncompromising, and aggressive soundness upon the currency question, regardless of all partisan considerations, compares with that of Grover Cleveland ; and his financial record belongs to the party which has three times, with full knowledge of his views, deliberately made him its candidate for the Presidency, and has twice elected him to that office. A party which stands behind such a leader, even though it contains a minority which dissents from his policy, is safer than a party which, claiming to be the sole guardian of sound financial principles, is always compromising when it should fight ; a party which inflicted upon the country the untold disasters resulting from the Sherman silver law, in order to keep the silver producers within its party lines, and to save its President from the danger of having to act upon a free coinage bill.

3. The principles of the Democratic party require the withdrawal of the treasury from the banking business and the retirement of all forms of fiat money. In the words of our State platform of last year, we believe "that it is the sole

function of the federal government in monetary matters to provide a standard of value, and to coin metallic money, every dollar of which shall be of equal intrinsic value; that nothing but this coined money shall be a legal tender, and that the government shall not carry on a banking business." The recent platform of the Democracy of the State of New York has joined in the demand for the retirement of the greenbacks, and there is every indication that the national Democratic party will be committed to this programme. The Republican party, on the other hand, is not opposed on principle to the continuance of the government in the banking business, or to fiat money; and its leaders have shown no disposition to assist in the work of getting the treasury back upon a sound and legitimate basis.

4. The representatives of the silver mining interest in the Republican party are more dangerous than the friends of free coinage in the Democratic party. The former, supported by a large financial interest, purely selfish in its demands, will be satisfied with no measure that does not enhance the price of their product. The latter, representing agricultural communities where the need of more circulating medium is felt, will be satisfied with a measure which opens the door, under proper safeguards, for freer banking, with increased circulation of bank-notes.

5. The sound money men in the Democratic party have shown over and over again that they will not compromise with financial heresy; and, except as a basis from which to compromise, the proposition for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by this country alone is so wildly impracticable that it is hardly dangerous. The Republican leaders, on the other hand, judging by their past record, will compromise the silver question whenever they can see a chance to unite their party by doing so. This fact and their general protectionist inclinations make the adoption by their party of some such proposition as the free coinage of the American silver product a constant possibility and menace.

MAINTENANCE OF GOLD STANDARD.

While we have in this country a bimetallic currency, and shall doubtless continue to have it, we have not a bimetallic standard. Every sensible man knows that the establishment of such a standard is only possible, if at all, by international action; and even the warmest friends of international bimetallism are obliged to acknowledge that there are no present prospects of its adoption. The hopes excited by the accession of the Conservatives to office in England and the elevation of Mr. Balfour to the position of government leader of the House of Commons are already seen to be baseless.

Gold is to-day the sole standard of value and the real money of redemption in this country, and this may as well be recognized in plain language. The fundamental currency question is whether it shall remain so, or whether we shall adopt the silver standard in its place, and settle all of our debts, public and private, on a silver basis. There is no middle ground.

The present position has arisen from the extraordinary decline in the market value of silver, due to its greatly increased and cheapened production. Our silver dollars have indeed an intrinsic value, but one much below their face value. The difference is represented by faith in their exchangeability into gold dollars. With the existing volume of silver money, large as it is, this faith can easily be maintained by such wise and resolute management of the treasury as it has had under Secretary Carlisle: and the increased demand for circulating medium arising from the growth of the country will constantly make the task easier. The stoppage of further purchases of silver was the crucial point. The unconditional repeal of the Sherman law, through the firm insistence of President Cleveland, secured this first condition of safety. No renewal of such purchases can be undertaken with safety for very many years to come, and any proposition looking to that end should be resisted as strenuously as free coinage itself.

THE TARIFF.

Coming finally to the question of the tariff, what is there here of which the Republicans can make a winning issue? The passage of the act of 1894 has left them in a most embarrassing position, where they must choose between antagonizing the business interests of the country or abandoning their own economic principles.

It rests entirely with them to say whether the agitation of the subject of the tariff which the country passed through during the seven years from 1887 to 1894 shall be renewed in the immediate future, or whether business, already so largely restored to a prosperous condition, shall again be subjected to the doubt and uncertainty which a threatened tariff revision inevitably brings with it.

During this period, dating from President Cleveland's tariff message in December, 1887, to the enactment of the present tariff in August, 1894, we have had two presidential elections, and one intervening Congressional election, in which the tariff was by far the leading issue. We have had two tariff bills enacted, each after prolonged contests in Congress, during which business was disturbed and enterprise checked.

It took four years to repeal the McKinley tariff, in spite of the fact that overwhelming popular condemnation was pronounced upon it at the election of 1890, within a few weeks of its enactment. At the same rate, it would take three years from the present time to repeal the tariff of 1894. With the greatest possible Republican successes, it would be two years from next December before a Republican Congress could be in session, with a Republican President in the White House; and, if it took as long to enact a new Republican tariff measure as it did to formulate and pass the McKinley bill, it would be October, 1898, before the present law could be changed. One question is, therefore, this: In order to secure possible changes in the present tariff three years hence, do the business men

of the country wish to subject the present business situation, with the large measure of prosperity already restored, with the glowing promise of the next few years, to the strain and unsettlement of an immediate reopening of the tariff question?

If there is to be such a reopening, the Republican party must, in the nature of the situation, be alone responsible for it. It may take two to make a fight, but it only takes one to begin it.

The differences of opinion which prevailed in the Democratic party last year in regard to the framing of the present tariff bill are only interesting as matters of political history. They concern the past, not the present or the future. The supreme test of a political party is not what it says, but what it does. The Democratic party as a political organization is responsible for the tariff of 1891. It can no more evade that responsibility than it can evade the responsibility for the repeal of the federal elections law; and it has no disposition to do so.

It would not be honest to say that the act as passed fully satisfied the aspirations of the Democratic masses or fully represented the views of the wisest Democratic statesmen; but, so far as it went in the direction of lowering duties and striking the shackles from commerce, it had the unanimous support of the whole Democratic party. The act was in every respect, from a Democratic standpoint, an improvement over the McKinley bill.

Thus the Democratic party now holds the position of conservator of the industrial peace; it occupies the conservative ground; it defends the maintenance of the present status. It has had its day in court, and its work is on trial before the jury of public opinion. It is willing to leave it there. All it asks is time for the formation of an intelligent opinion. Fact is better than argument: experience is worth more than theory. The practical results of the present tariff during the next few years will be vastly more enlightening than all the predictions of what it is going to do that could be printed in all the Republican papers of the country from now to the next presidential election. Once more it is a condition, and not a theory, that confronts us. That condition is the wonderfully quick return of prosperity, the revival of industry, the full employment of labor, and the increase of wages under a Democratic tariff. We may well leave to our Republican friends the task of making this condition of affairs harmonize with their theories.

Unfortunately for the country, the Republican party upon the tariff question seems hopelessly wedded to its idols. When the Wilson bill, coming from the House, was put in its present form in the Senate, the Republican senators had one of the best opportunities to get rid of a troublesome issue that was ever presented to a political party. They could have taken the wind almost completely out of the sails of their opponents by saying that, while they did not altogether like the Senate bill, they would accept it as a compromise measure, and by so doing eliminate the tariff issue from politics. Instead of having the breadth of view and the foresight to improve this priceless opportunity, they continued to oppose the bill, to denounce it as a free-trade measure, and to prophesy disaster from its

passage. With their usual short-sighted fatuity, the Republican leaders missed their opportunity then, and are again committing their party now to an immediate reopening of the tariff question. Senator Sherman, one of the wisest and most experienced of these, frankly favors the re-enactment of the McKinley bill "with such changes as time may make necessary," and the reimposition of a high duty upon wool. The leading party organs are insistent that the restoration of McKinleyism shall be the issue, whether McKinley is the candidate or not. Even those Republicans who are disposed to be the most cautious demand that the present law shall be made "uniformly protective."

NO ONE-SIDED CONTEST.

Some leading Republican politicians, misled by the sweeping victory won by their party at the election of a year ago, seem to assume that the restoration of McKinleyism can be brought about without arousing a counter-demand for the further reduction of duties below the figures of the present law. No mistake could be greater. While the people generally are, I believe, ready to accept the present tariff as a satisfactory compromise, and to sink the tariff question out of sight for years to come, yet they will not permit a one-sided issue to be raised. If an issue is raised at all, it cannot be merely between the maintenance of present tariff rates and the restoration of McKinley duties. The present tariff can be revised downward as well as upward; and, if the doorway of revision is to be thrown open, the forces of tariff reform will again be let loose, and the whole contest must be again fought out, with the advocates of reform standing upon the vantage-ground of the present law. Therefore, let our Republican friends dismiss the delusion that they can get up a contest in which friends of high protection have everything to gain and nothing to lose, and face the serious consequences of their course. Let them be wise in time, and let well enough alone.

If any section of the country has been particularly well treated in the present bill, and should therefore be the last to join in any effort to sweep it from the statute book before it has even been fairly tried, it is New England. This has not arisen, it is needless to say, from any political claims of our section upon the Democratic party, but has been a necessary incident of the carrying out of the economic policy of freeing from taxation the raw materials of industry. Except a little lumber and stone, we produce next to nothing in the way of raw material. While the Democratic policy was not carried as far as it should have been in the bill as passed, it nevertheless contained substantial and far-reaching steps in the right direction, sufficient to confer a vast benefit upon the manufacturing industries of New England.

At the same time the rates of duty upon our leading manufactures, particularly of cotton and wool, while reduced from prohibitory rates, were left high enough to answer every reasonable requirement, even from the standpoint of pro-

tection. It would be a sorry return for the consideration with which they have been treated if the manufacturers of New England should turn away from those who have so befriended them, and throw themselves into the arms of those who would restore high taxes upon wool and the other raw materials of our great industries; and they might find, in so doing, that the result would be to place them at the time of the next tariff revision in the hands of radical free-traders.

THE REVENUES.

Republicans are fond of denouncing the present tariff for producing insufficient revenue. The answer is twofold: first, that, while there has been, during the last two years, equally under the McKinley bill and the present tariff, an insufficient revenue for the time being, owing to industrial depression, conditions have so far changed that we have a surplus for the month of September; and it is altogether likely, in the opinion of the best experts, that the shortage for the present fiscal year will be a small one, if, indeed, there is any at all, and that after this year there will be an ample revenue; second, that the framers of the act cannot fairly be blamed for the loss of revenue caused by the Supreme Court annulment of the income tax provision of the law. Moreover, if it had not been for the extraordinary and unforeseen decline in the price of raw sugar, the *ad valorem* duty upon that article would also have been larger by many millions of dollars. So it cannot be charged against the framers of the present law that they did not make reasonable calculations for insuring a sufficient revenue, however unforeseen occurrences may have rendered it temporarily insufficient. Furthermore, so far as the last fiscal year is concerned, it would hardly have been sound policy to have framed a measure with a view to bringing in an adequate revenue during a year of such extraordinary shrinkage in receipts and general depression, as a measure so framed would have brought in too great a surplus revenue upon the restoration of prosperity.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

There remains the question of civil service reform, and here the Republican party has everything to lose by a comparison between its record in office and that of the Democratic administrations of President Cleveland. The public has come to understand pretty clearly that the one supreme test of executive sympathy with this reform and desire to promote it — a test in comparison with which individual appointments and removals are of very slight significance — is the action taken to extend the civil service system by bringing more offices within its scope. This is the only thing that a President can do which insures the permanent advance of the merit system, for every forward step is binding upon his successors. President

Harrison, down to the time of his defeat in 1892, had measured the extent of his devotion to civil service reform by extending original classification to just 766 persons. President Cleveland, down to the 1st of June, had in his present term extended original classification to over 6,000 persons; and since that time the clerks in pension agencies and the employees in the government printing-office have been added, increasing that number by several thousand.

Another step of great importance in the direction of establishing the merit system in a branch of the public service that cannot be brought directly within the scope of the civil service rules has just been taken by the President, upon the recommendation of Secretary Olney.

Consulates of a certain class, including about three-quarters of the whole number, are hereafter to be filled either by transfer or promotion within the service, by restoration to the service of persons formerly connected with it, or by non-competitive examinations of persons selected therefor by the President. The executive order of President Cleveland establishing this new system,—while it cannot, unfortunately, be made binding upon his successors,—carried out in the spirit that it will be under this administration, will make an important beginning in the separation of our consular service from politics, which the business organizations of the country have justly been urging. In no branch of the public service will the introduction of a new system of appointment result in as large a pecuniary gain to the government through stopping the undervaluation of imports at its source, and in no branch is such a change more important for sentimental and patriotic reasons.

The measure now adopted, while it will doubtless fail to meet the expectations of some persons whose zeal for reform is in excess of their knowledge how to secure it, and while it is already denounced by Republican partisans as a device to keep Democrats in office, has the merit of being simple and practicable. If only a first step, it is a sure and safe one, and will not have to be retraced. It will give to this administration the great credit of having inaugurated the long-called-for reformation of our consular service.

Having said this much, I wish to add a few words more in refutation of a charge which has been given considerable currency,—the charge that this administration in its first six months “debauched” the consular service by filling it with men appointed without regard to fitness and on the lowest partisan considerations.

Some persons have gone so far as to bring the further charge against President Cleveland that he surrendered his constitutional prerogative of appointing consuls to an Assistant Secretary of State, and allowed him to originate and carry out a policy of “looting” the service.

While this charge is hardly consistent with the known characteristics of the President, some people may have been credulous enough to believe it. Let me therefore say, as I am in a position to do, that President Cleveland has always assumed the full responsibility both of the policy adopted and of the manner

in which it was carried out. Claiming nothing for myself beyond a painstaking effort to assist him in the carrying out of his views and purposes in regard to this service, I repel the charge that this administration "debauched" the consular service as unfounded in fact and inspired either by ignorance or malice.

Political considerations had as much, and no more, to do with the selection of consuls by this administration as they have had under preceding administrations. We found a service filled with men who had been appointed, a large number of them under President Harrison, as a reward for political service or through political influence,—some of them men who were sent to Europe for the sole purpose of supplying high tariff arguments. We found a service containing some conspicuously good consuls, who have been retained, but in which not one-half of the incumbents had sufficient claim to retention on their merits, and not a few of whom were totally unfit. No real reform could be effected without a considerable change of the *personnel*; and, as long as the service was on a political basis, President Cleveland properly preferred to appoint Democrats. In view of the fact that as many Republican consuls have been left in office as there were Democratic consuls when this administration came in, I fail to see that any political injustice has been done to the Republican party or any of its members.

In making the new appointments, an effort was made to distribute them as fairly as possible among the different States, in accordance with the principle adopted in the civil service law. That the appointments were, on the whole, as good as could have been made under a strictly merit system, I should be the last to contend. But I do claim with entire confidence that quite a number of them could not have been improved upon under any system, and that the changes, as a whole, materially improved the *personnel* of the service, both in character and ability.

More than twenty former consuls were restored to the service upon the strength of their official records. A larger proportion of men capable of speaking the language of the countries to which they were sent, and a larger proportion of young men, were appointed than ever before. I challenge any fair investigation of the claim which I now make, after obtaining the fullest information in my power, not only from the State Department but from other sources, that our consular reports have never been as intelligent or as valuable to the country as they now are, and that we have never under Republican administrations had a body of consuls who, upon the average, stood as well, with Americans coming in contact with them abroad and with the people among whom they reside, as do those now in office.

The new and better system will start with more consuls in office who are worthy of continuance in the service upon their merits than there ever have been, within our generation at least. Thus the administration can claim the credit, first, of improving our consular representation, and, second, of establishing a system that tends to make such improvement permanent.

The Democracy of Massachusetts may well be proud of having furnished to

this administration a man who, having filled the position of Attorney-general with conspicuous ability and credit for two years, has been recently called by the President, with universal approval, to the first place in his cabinet. We may well rejoice that it has been our privilege to make such a conspicuous contribution as we have done in the person of Richard Olney to the success and efficiency of this administration, and to show to the country that the old Commonwealth, whose sons have borne so large a part in the federal government from the beginning, is still producing men able to fill the highest executive offices at Washington.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Passing to questions of State government, no State issue can be of greater fundamental importance than that of the maintenance of the full rights of local self-government, as opposed to State centralization. Here is a party issue that is definite and distinct, an issue between irreconcilable political principles.

The Democratic party believes in the sacred American right of local control of local affairs, at all times and in all places. It believes in this right, regardless of any comparison between the results of local control or of State control in any particular instance. It believes that it is no use to try to make the stream rise higher than its source; that it is better to place upon every community the duty of working out its own salvation than to save it even from the consequences of the folly or indifference of its citizens, at the expense of teaching them to look to the interposition of some outside power rather than to their own efforts.

It has been said that a wise and benevolent despotism is the best government; but it will hardly be contended that it would be consistent with American political ideas to prefer it to Democracy. Possibly, although we do not believe it, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can manage the local affairs of its cities and towns better through State officials appointed by the governor than they are now managed by the local officers chosen by the people; but from the standpoint of Democracy this question is entirely irrelevant.

When the Republican party took away from the people of Boston the control and administration of their own police force, supported by local taxation, it committed itself to a vicious and dangerous policy. It invited any citizens of any other city of the Commonwealth who were dissatisfied with their police force to apply to the State to assume its management. The first extension of this policy came last year, when the city of Fall River was also placed under State guardianship. The results of State control in that city, if I am correctly informed, are not such as to encourage its adoption elsewhere, unless from the standpoint of Republican party advantage. This year the Republican legislature passed bills placing the cities of Holyoke and Woburn under the same system; and, though the gubernatorial veto prevented for the moment these extensions of the State police idea, yet the Republican party will carry it further if it has the power.

The authority to grant liquor licenses, and to control the liquor traffic through the police force, is too attractive a political temptation for that party to be able to resist it.

The zealous representative of the system of State police control in the city of Boston, General Martin, has had the clearness of vision to see just where Republican legislation is carrying us and the courage to advocate the extension of the policy to its logical conclusion. A State police force for all the cities of the Commonwealth, transferable from one point to another and controlled by the orders of a single head, is his proposition; and it has the merit of simplicity and comprehensiveness. Those who favor it can vote the Republican ticket in the confidence that it cannot fail in the long run to commend itself to that party. Then let us complete the work by giving to this police force the powers which it would have in Russia, and we shall be saved a great deal of the trouble and annoyance which is caused by local control of the police power.

THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

Another question pertaining to State politics calls for brief mention. A year ago we charged upon the Republican party — and the charge was well founded at that time — a tacit alliance with A. P. A.-ism. The members of that organization had been allowed to dominate Republican caucuses and control Republican nominations, and not a single Republican leader of prominence had openly repudiated and denounced its so-called principles.

Since that time the most eminent Republican of the State, Senator Hoar, has publicly given his views of this organization and its purposes in language which, for clearness and emphasis, left nothing to be desired. The present Republican governor has also said and done enough to show that he has no sympathy with A. P. A.-ism, and to draw down upon himself the antagonism of its advocates; and a majority of his party have apparently supported him in this course.

As patriotic citizens of the Commonwealth, placing her good name, threatened by this movement for the introduction of religious intolerance and racial antagonism into her politics, above all partisan interests, we would rejoice to see the party now in control of the State shake off such a pernicious alliance. But it still remains for the Republican Convention by its platform declaration either to complete the work or to invite a renewal of the same contest next year. It would not require the rhetorical resources of Senator Hoar to frame a plank which would settle the question whether A. P. A.-ism is consistent with Republicanism in this Commonwealth; but it will take something more than a vague generality to do it. If it is not, there cannot be a better year than this to declare that fact, and put an end to this agitation so far as the two great political parties are concerned.

If the Republican party, with a majority of 65,000 behind it at the last State election, cannot muster up strength enough to face this issue directly and un-



equivocally this year, and dispose of it once for all, it is woefully lacking both in courage and political sagacity. Not one-quarter of those who are affiliated with this movement could possibly be driven out of the Republican party by the most radical declaration in opposition to their views: and the Republican leaders well know that these men would have no inclination, and that they would be the last to receive an invitation, to act with the Democratic party, whose fundamental principles are diametrically opposed to their ideas. A. P. A.-ism simply lives in this State on its hope of controlling the Republican party. It will go to pieces if that hope is taken away from it. The Republican Convention has an opportunity to render a signal service to the cause of good politics in this Commonwealth.

REPUBLICAN PARTISANSHIP.

There is one fact that must not be overlooked when Governor Greenhalge advances claims to receive non-partisan support. In the administration of his office, so far as appointments to the salaried commissions, in which the actual government of the State is so largely vested, are concerned,—and the making of these appointments is perhaps the most important duty attaching to the gubernatorial office,—he has deliberately ostracized the Democratic party, and denied it even fair minority representation. Whether he has adopted this policy of partisan proscription because it conforms with his personal views of political propriety, or because the appetite of the Republican party for office, after its partial exclusion under Governor Russell, had become so ravenous that nothing could stand against it, we need not inquire. The fact remains that the more than fair consideration which Governor Russell gave to individual Republicans whom he found in office, and to the claims of that party for representation on commissions, have been requited by Governor Greenhalge by this unworthy policy of partisan proscription.

Fellow-Democrats, let us enter the coming contest with renewed confidence in the principles of our party and in their continued triumph. Misrepresentation, prejudice, and disappointment have had their day. The people are once more ready to listen to argument and to be guided by reason. Proud of the record of our national administration and of the great legislative accomplishments of a Democratic Congress, let us go before them with aggressive confidence, based upon the firm faith that in the long run they can always be trusted to see the right and to support it.